

RANDY ANDRUS, State Bar No. 116745
ANDRUS & ASSOCIATES
620 Coolidge Drive, Suite 165
Folsom, California 95630
Telephone: (916) 608-9090

Attorney for Plaintiff
JAVIER RAIGOZA

CECILY WATERMAN, State Bar No. 63502
ERIC MECKLEY, State Bar No. 168181
MONA BADANI, State Bar No. 227389
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
One Market, Spear Street Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105-1126
Tel: 415.442.1000
Fax: 415.442.1001

Attorneys for Defendants
ARAMARK Uniform & Career Apparel, Inc.,
ARAMARK Corporation; ARAMARK UNIFORM
AND CAREER APPAREL GROUP, INC.;
MICHAEL BRODEUR; BILL VERVALIN; KERM
HANSEN; JACOB VERVALIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SACRAMENTO DIVISION

JAVIER RAIGOZA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ARAMARK CORPORATION;
ARAMARK UNIFORM AND CAREER
APPAREL, INC.; ARAMARK
UNIFORM AND CAREER APPAREL
GROUP, INC.; MICHAEL BRODEUR;
BILL VERVALIN; KERM HANSEN;
JACOB VERVALIN

Defendants.

Case No. CIV.S-04-1208 GEB KM

**STIPULATION AND STATEMENT OF
GOOD CAUSE FOR CONTINUANCE OF
PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND
SUBMISSION OF JOINT PRETRIAL
STATEMENT**

WHEREAS Plaintiff Javier Raigoza ("Plaintiff") and Defendants Aramark Corporation,
Aramark Uniform and Career Apparel, Inc., Aramark Uniform and Career Apparel Group, Inc.,

FILED

NOV 30 2005

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY _____

1 Michael Brodeur, Bill Vervalin, Jacob Vervalin and Kerm Hansen ("Defendants") (together as
2 the "Parties") hereby STIPULATE AND AGREE, pursuant to Local Rule 83-141, as follows:

3 A. Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment (the "Motion") which was
4 scheduled for hearing on October 24, 2005. The Court has taken Defendants' Motion under
5 submission, and the Parties are awaiting a ruling on the Motion.

6 B. Pursuant to the Court's November 5, 2004 Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Order, the
7 final Pretrial Conference in this case is scheduled for Monday, December 12, 2005. Pursuant to
8 the Court's Order, the Parties must submit their Joint Pretrial Statement, and related documents,
9 to the Court no later than Monday, December 5, 2005. The deadline for submission of the Joint
10 Pretrial Statement and related documents is, as of the filing of this Stipulation, only six (6)
11 business days away.

12 C. The Parties jointly desire to continue the dates for the submission of their Joint
13 Pretrial Statement and the final Pretrial Conference to dates which are at least 2 and 3 weeks,
14 respectively, *after* the issuance of the Court's ruling on Defendants' Motion.

15 D. Good cause exists in this case for this continuance based upon the following: The
16 Court's ruling on Defendants' Motion will determine the factual and legal issues, if any, to be
17 addressed in the Joint Pretrial Statement. The Parties will need to devote a significant amount of
18 time and expense to prepare the Joint Pretrial Statement and the related materials which must be
19 submitted. If the Court's ruling on Defendants' Motion does not dispose of the entire case, the
20 Parties have only 6 or less business days before the date on which the Joint Pretrial Statement and
21 related documents must be submitted. Prior to issuance of the Court's ruling on Defendants'
22 Motion, the Parties wish to avoid unnecessary expense associated with preparing the Joint Pretrial
23 Statement. Even if the Court were to issue its ruling on the Motion within the next day or so, the
24 remaining time is insufficient to prepare the Joint Pretrial Statement and related submissions.

25 E. Continuance of the final Pretrial Conference will serve the interests of all Parties in
26 the litigation and not otherwise affect the Court's established schedule in this case or the affect
27 the March 26, 2005 trial date.

28 F. Neither of the Parties' counsel is available on Monday, December 26, 2005 or

1 Monday, January 3, 2006 because of the holidays and therefore request that these deadlines be
2 continued to dates other than these.

3
4 Dated: November 21, 2005

RANDY ANDRUS

5 By Randy Andrus
6 Attorneys for Plaintiff

7
8 Dated: November 22, 2005

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

9
10 By Eric Meckley
11 Eric Meckley
12 Attorneys for Defendants

13 **ORDER**

14 Based upon the above stipulation and for good cause appearing, this Court hereby
15 modifies the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Order in this matter in the following respect: The final
16 Pretrial Conference will be held on Jan. 9, 2006, at 2:30p and the Joint Pretrial
17 Statement will be due on Jan. 3, 2006.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

19 Dated: 11/30, 2005

20 Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
21 Hon. Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
22 United States District Judge